

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/5878.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Chopra Rubber Industries Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 156 of 1983

between

SHRI RAGHUBIR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S CHOPRA RUBBER INDUSTRIES, SONEPAT

Present :

Shri R. S. Lakra, A. R. for the workman.

Shri Rajinder Singh, A. R., for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute to this Court, between Shri Raghbir Singh workman and the management of M/s. Chopra Rubber Industries, Sonapat, for adjudication, vide Labour Department Notification No. IL/49026-31, dated 19th September, 1983 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Raghbir Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. Before any steps could be taken in adjudication of the reference, the authorised representative for the workman Shri R. S. Lakra stated that all his efforts to procure the presence of the workman have failed and that the where-about of the workman are not known to him. There is no address of the workman upon the order of reference. His address is through his authorised representative Shri R. S. Lakra. Under these circumstances, I am left with no alternative but dismiss the reference for non-prosecution.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.
Camp Court at Sonapat.

Dated the 2nd August, 1984.

Endorsement No. 156-83/2783, dated the 21st August, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court at Sonapat.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/5879.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s S. K. International, M-4, Industrial Area, Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 203 of 83

between

SHRI RAM SUHAWAN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S S. K. INTERNATIONAL, M-4, INDUSTRIAL AREA, SONEPAT.

Present:—

Shri Bahadur Yadav, A. R., for the workman.

Shri Rajinder Singh, A. R., for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute to this Court, between Shri Ram Suhawan, workman of M/s. S. K. International, M-4, Industrial Area, Sonapat for adjudication, —vide Labour Department Notification No. 58724-29, dated 9th November, 1983 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Suhawan was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared. Before any further steps could be taken for adjudication of the reference, authorised representative of the workman Shri Bahadur Yadav made a statement that the workman has settled his claim with the respondent management and that this court need not go into the merits of the reference at all. So the dispute between the parties have been settled amicably and this reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 2nd August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court at Sonapat.

Endorsement No. 208-84/2784, dated the 21st August, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B.P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court at Sonapat.

No. 9/5/84-Lab/5880.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Supreme Tractors, Hissar.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 18 of 81

between

SHRI VEER SAIN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SUPREME
TRACTORS, HISSAR

Present

Shri T. C. Gupta, A. R., for the workman.

Shri B. D. Mehta, A. R., for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute to this Court, between Shri Veer Sain, workman and the management of M/s. Supreme Tractors, Hissar, for adjudication, —vide Labour Department Notification No. ID/HSR/69-80/411, dated 5th January, 1981 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Veer Sain was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties as usual. The parties appeared. After the workman had filed his statement of claim and the respondent detailed a written statement and

the issues had been framed thereupon and the parties had gone through the gamut of producing evidence and the case posted for arguments, which had been heard in part, happily a settlement was arrived at in my presence, where under the workman relinquished his entire claim of reinstatement, Gratuity, back wages, after accepting a sum of Rs. 2,500 from the management. So in terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties, I find that the termination of the workman was unjustified but since he has voluntarily relinquished his claim after settlement with the management, he cannot be reinstated or awarded Gratuity or back wages. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated the 7th August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court at Hissar.

Endst. No. 18/81/2785, dated 21st August, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court at Hissar.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/5882.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Haryana Agro Foods and Fruit Processing Plant, Murthal, Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
ROHTAK

Reference No 143 of 82
between

SHRI ANAND KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. HARYANA
AGRO FOODS AND FRUIT PROCESSING PLANT, MURTHAL, SONEPAT

Present:

Shri Bahadur Yadav, A. R., for the workman.
Shri Surinder Kaushal, Advocate for the respondent.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute to this Court, between Shri Anand Kumar, workman and the management of M/s Haryana Agro Foods and Fruit Processing Plant, Murthal, Sonapat for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Notification No. ID/SPT/37/82/34283, dated 22nd July, 1982 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Anand Kumar was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared. After the workman had filed claim statement, the respondent management a reply and before the case could proceed further, the workman settled his claim with the respondent management. His statement has been recorded in that behalf. He has stated that the management has agreed to reinstate him but he has given up his claim regarding back wages. So, I find that the termination of services of the workman was illegal, but since the workman was voluntarily relinquished his claim regarding back wages, the same cannot be awarded to him. However, he shall have benefit of continuity of service. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 10th August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst. No. 143-82/2787, dated 21st August, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.